Vol XVI

#7256-a

M-621

Cases 180

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

VINCENT RAYMOND DUNNE, et al

TESTIMONY TAKEN

November 21, 1941.

Pages 2077 to 2220

FILED Nov. 25 1941

THOMAS H. HOWARD, Clerk,

By [illegible] Deputy

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

I N D E X

Witness	D.Ex.	Cr.Ex.	Red.Ex.	Recr.Ex.
James P. Cannon		2077	2119	2121
Kenneth E. McKenzie	2122			
Daniel E. Doyle	2127	2133		
Ole G. Reiersen	2135	2138		
Harold B. Martin	2142	2147		
Richard E. Atherton	2152			
Gustave Reierson	2156	2162		
Vincent Raymond Dunne	2163			

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

12

Q Jack Smith? A Yes.

Q And who was financial secretary, if you know? A I can't remember if it was Kelly Postal or Farrell Dobbs. I believe it was Kelly Postal at that time.

Q And do you know who was recording secretary? A I am quite sure it was Grant Dunne.

Q Well, V. R. Dunne was not an officer then? A No.

Q Do you know how it came that he spoke? A I believe he was an organizer of the union and he always was a good friend of the union.

Q He was a good friend of the union? A Yes.

Q Or was the union a good friend of his? A Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: That is all.

(Witness excused.)

MR. GOLDMAN: Mr. Vincent Raymond Dunne.

VINCENT RAYMOND DUNNE

was called as a witness on behalf of the Defendants, and having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Goldman:

Q Will you give the reporter your name, please?

A Vincent Raymond Dunne.

Q Where do you live, Mr. Dunne? A 2883 Holmes Avenue.

Q Louder, please. How long have you been living in Minneapolis?

A A little more than thirty years.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

13 Q And where did you live before that? A My home before coming to Minneapolis was at Little Falls, Minnesota.

Q Where were you born, Mr. Dunne? A In Kansas City, Kansas.

Q How old are you? A Fifty-two.

Q What is your occupation at the present? A I am an organizer for Local 544, CIO.

Q And how long have you been at your present occupation?

A Since the early days of the organization of the Drivers' Union in 1934.

Q But how long have you been working for the CIO?

A Since June 9th, this year.

Q Of what year? A This year.

Q And what were you doing before that? A Organizer for the Drivers' Union, AFL, 544.

Q When did you become such organizer? A In 1937, that is, as an official paid organizer.

Q And were you ever an unofficial unpaid organizer?

A Unpaid organizer, yes, for several years before that.

Q What did you do before you became an official paid organizer?

A I worked at various jobs that I could get, including some of the governmental made work jobs.

Q Some what? A Some of the governmental made work jobs -- CWA, ERA, and so forth.

Q WPA? A WPA, also.

Q When did you first start organizing the Truck Drivers here in

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Minneapolis? A Well, it was a long process of attempting to organize and laying a basis for the organization, which actually became a definite campaign for actual union organization, with some possibilities of success, in 1933, but prior to that time we had made many efforts.

Q Will you speak to the last juror there so that everybody will be able to hear, please? A Yes. During the period that I worked in the transfer industry here, and the general trucking industry -- more particularly in the coal yards and retail coal industry -- many efforts were made to organize the drivers, and they were usually not crowned with much success until 1933 or 1934.

Q Did you work in any coal yard? A Yes.

Q When did you work in a coal yard? A I worked for the DeLaittre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931, I believe it was.

Q And when did you start organizing the coal drivers, Mr. Dunne? A Well, as I say, definitely progress was made towards the organization of the coal drivers in 1933. Attempts had been made at that for a few years before.

Q And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard? A Well, over the period of years, I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally--that is, drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, run an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

a weigh master, so-called, weighing out coal.

Q What was the situation of the drivers as far as organization is concerned up to 1933 and '34? A The coal yard workers especially, and together with them, if I understand your question, the vast majority of the drivers and workers in the coal yards, the drivers and the warehousemen who later became organized in this campaign were virtually unorganized. There was very little organization.

Q Can you tell us how many men -- was there a Local of the Teamsters' Union prior to 1933? A Yes, there had been an AFL union here of the Teamsters for a long period of time.

Q And how many members did that Local have?

A Up to the organization of the coal yard workers, the General Drivers Union here -- that is, that later became the large Local it is now -- had a rather unhealthy life. It had from -- all the way from 50 workers to sometimes one hundred or two, -- averaging around 100 workers during a period of years.

Q And when did the first big organizing campaign of the coal yard drivers commence? A Well, definitely in 1933 it took on its best form and actually resulted in the organization of the coal yard workers.

Q Were you involved in that? A Yes, I was involved in the work of the coal yard organization work, although at the time of the strike I was not working. I had been discharged from my job.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q For your organizing activities?

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Please don't lead him.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) What were you discharged for?

A I was discharged by the Fuel Distributors who I was then working for. That firm absorbed -- or later, the DeLaittre-Dixon Company merged with the Fuel Distributors Company, which is a Ford subsidiary here, Henry Ford subsidiary, and I was transferred to that company from the DeLaittre-Dixon Company, and during the year of 1932 I was very active in organizing meetings and speaking at meetings -- after hours, naturally -- against the menace of the rise of Hitler in Germany. I was fired for speaking at such meetings, meetings held in the Court House, in the Mayor's reception room of the Court House.

Q Who fired you? A Mr. Smith, the manager of the Fuel Distributors Company.

Q Who else participated with you in the organization drive of the coal truck drivers? A Well, a great many men in the coal yards. As a matter of fact, I should say that dozens of active coal yard workers participated in that organization campaign.

Q Well, who of the defendants played a leading role in that campaign? A Well, men like Carl Skoglund, my brother Miles, Harry DeBoer, Farrell Dobbs, Kelly Postal -- men of this kind, and most of the men that are now connected with the union that are on trial here in one way or another were more or less active in that campaign -- most of them very active.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q Was there any strike? A There was a coal strike, yes, in February of 1934.

Q And what, if any, negotiations took place before the strike?

A Well, the negotiations that were attempted by the coal yard workers and the union were unsuccessful, I would say, because the employers virtually refused to meet with the union and its representatives -- the representatives of the men. That is, we did have -- not I personally, but the committees in charge -- I was not on the committee -- but reports were made from time to time of attempts at negotiations. We in that period dealt with the cold yard employers. We tried to deal with them individually -- not that we wanted to do it that way, but that was about the only way that any negotiations could be started -- that is, individual employers would say that they were not responsible, they couldn't do anything alone.

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Just a minute. I think this is irrelevant, if your Honor please, and I object to it.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Then what was the result of the negotiations?

A The result of the negotiations was a refusal on the part of the employers to agree that the committees in the union represented the men.

Q And what happened after that? A A strike was called.

Q Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A The men who worked in the yards.

Q And how long did the strike last? A Three days, as I recall.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

18

Q And what was the result? A Well, the result of the strike was a victory for the union in the sense that we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q Was such an election held? A Yes.

Q And what was the result of the election?

A The result was an overwhelming vote for the union and its representatives, virtually no votes against.

Q What, if any, agreement was entered into between the union and the employers? A An agreement was entered into, a rather loose form of an agreement, but nevertheless, a working agreement that raised the wages of the men, bettered their conditions and gave some regularity to the lives of the men in the coal yards. As a matter of fact, some very sharp advances were made in the beneficial conditions that were obtained that way.

Q When was the next strike that was conducted by the union following this settlement of the coal truck drivers and the employers? A The next strike occurred in May of 1934.

Q Who called that strike? A Local 574, the union to which the men belonged and who represented the overwhelming majority of the men.

Q What negotiations, if any, were attempted to prevent that strike?

A A long, long series of negotiations were held, or rather, attempts at negotiations, I should say, which took on very much

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

the same form as the negotiations that were attempted in the coal strike -- virtual refusal of the employers to agree that the union represented the men.

Q And how long did that -- who authorized the calling of the strike, Mr. Dunne? A A mass meeting of the strikers themselves, the workers themselves voted on the calling of the strike.

Q And which ones of the defendants, do you remember, participated in that strike? A Well, practically all of the men from 544 and other of the defendants, such as Oscar Coover, who was not a member of that union -- the active trade unionists in general helped in the strike, but in the preparation for it, the men who belonged to that union.

Q How long did the strike last? A About ten or eleven days, I believe.

Q And was there a settlement reached after that?

A Yes, a settlement was reached with the employers. That is, there was a -- not a contract signed -- it was a project, one might say, for a contract, an agreement to end the strike, granted the union recognition, granted them the right to represent the men, and with a small advance in wages. That is, small now -- we would call it small now -- but it was really a big advance for the men at that time as the wages were very low at that period, but the agreement was not in every sense a hard and fast contract, such as we know union contracts today.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Employers were adamant about not signing a contract with the union. We arrived at an agreement to end the strike in what could be said to be quite a compromise for the union. That is, a stipulation was actually what the agreement amounted to, but it did grant recognition to the union and gave wage raises and betterment of conditions to the men.

Q There was no formal contract then? A It was a stipulation; that is the correct term, I think.

Q What was the next strike that the union called?

A The next strike was called in July of that same year.

Q And what attempts, if any, were made to prevent that strike.

A Well, we put in, I am sure, almost a solid month of attempts at negotiation and ironing out the difficulties that had arisen. We attempted again to negotiate with the employers who had broken their agreement on the stipulation. That was the cause for the July strike. The employers had renegged on their agreement and tried to exclude from the benefits of the union, tried to claim that the men on the market, especially -- that is the warehousemen -- did not come under the jurisdiction of the drivers union. In other words, the employers attempted to set up the jurisdiction rights of the union and attempted to exclude from the benefits of the agreement that had been reached, those men who worked inside the warehouses and particularly the market men -- about a thousand to fifteen hundred were effected by that position of the --

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

21

Q Did the union attempt to settle these difference?

A We attempted to get the employers to agree that the stipulation arrived at in May actually covered these men, that the fact of the matter was that it did, but without avail.

Q Who authorized the calling of the strike? A The men of the union again.

Q How long did the strike last? A More than a month.

Q And what was the result? A The result of the July strike, so-called, was the victory of the union. That is, that it established its right to represent the men on the market, the men in the warehouses who came under the jurisdiction of the Drivers' Union. The result was an agreement, again a compromise as far as wages and conditions were concerned, but there we actually came to a better agreement, a more finished form of agreement with the employers.

Q What part did you play in all of these strikes, Mr. Dunne?

A Well, I was an active participant -- I should say a leading director or figure in the strikes. I took active part in directing the work of the men on strike, was on the strike committees, and functioned as one of the responsible men, leaders of the union, although not an officer of the union, not on the payroll of the union.

Q Who of the defendants were with you in the leadership of those strikes? A Well, about the same group of men that I have spoken of before -- practically all of the men, especially from

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

the Union 544 CIO that are here now, were active in that role.

Q What was the number of the Local under whose auspices all these strikes were called? A Local 574, AFL.

Q And was that part of any International? A That was part of the Teamsters International, so-called.

Q Did anything occur subsequent to the July strike which took 574 out of the International? A Yes. During the period just following the strikes of 1934, the local 574 was expelled from the Teamsters' International by President Tobin.

Q And what happened then? A The union continued as an independent union for about a year. That is, we were expelled-- the union, I should say -- its charter was revoked, --

Q Louder, please. A (Continuing) -- by Daniel Tobin, the President of the International Union, on the pretext that the per capita tax had not been paid. The union was, of course, bankrupt. It had no money. The men had no money and the treasury was absolutely non-existent. We recognized, as a part of the Federation of Labor -- American Federation of Labor, and as part of the Teamsters' International -- we recognized the obligation to the International to pay per capita tax when we could afford it, when we had the funds and dues payments, but President Tobin was absolutely impatient and expelled the union from the International for non-payment of the per capita tax.

Q How long did you remain out of the AFL? A We were out of the American Federation of Labor as an independent union then,

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

outside of the Teamsters' International from the summer or the spring of 1935 until July or August of 1936.

Q And what happened then? A During that period we maintained our existence as an independent union. However, closely cooperating with the rest of the labor movement here and associated with the labor movement in every way except by a formal affiliation. And in the spring of 1936, Mr. Tobin sent in a group of men whom had been recruited from other sections of his International to establish a dual charter here, a dual drivers movement. He sent in with this attempt a bunch of tough plug uglies to clean us out, to smash the union, to set up a new union. That was the form that Mr. Tobin's opposition took to our existence as a union. The struggle took place -- the union protecting itself from this form of assault in every possible way and we had the support of the entire labor movement in Minneapolis at that time.

Q And what was the final outcome? A The final outcome was a failure on the part of Mr. Tobin to wreck the union. That is, it resisted his efforts in every way and he finally made, through his representatives here in Minneapolis and representatives that he had sent in from the International, he made proposals to Local 574, then independent, to come back into the Teamsters' International. He had previously stated that they would never be allowed back in the International, and certainly none of the leaders would be allowed back.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q So that peace was made between the Local and the International?

A Yes, we entered into an agreement with the International Union and its officials, an agreement that brought the union back into the International on its former basis, and we, as we had offered to do before we were expelled, we resumed responsibility for per capital tax payments and for living up to the laws of the International. Mr. Tobin made an attempt to saddle upon us a semi-form of dictatorship, even in this agreement that we made.

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Just a moment.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) All right, I will go on now. Then what Local took the place of 574? A Local 544.

Q And when was that? A In August of 1936.

Q And did you become an officer, at that time, of Local 544?

A No, I was not an officer. I didn't push forward the idea of my being an officer, nor the men associated with me. That is, we made that as a concession to Mr. Tobin, so we had peace.

Q It was part of the agreement that you should not be an officer?

A That is correct.

Q Now, when did you first get an official post in 544?

A In 1937, early 1937, as I recall.

Q Now, after the July Strike of '34, what strikes, if any, did the union conduct? A Well, only a very few strikes occurred from the big strikes of '34 until the present day; although there have been several strikes, nevertheless at any time was there

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

any widespread strike that encompassed the entire union. If I recall the two strikes that could be called serious strikes, encompassing and covering a number of men, were strikes against the wholesale grocers, the wholesale grocery employers, in 1936 and again in 1937. Other than that, there have been comparatively few strikes.

Q And since 1937 have there been any strikes?

A Yes, there have been small strikes -- that is, against one single employer or a small group of employers, but no really important strike or strikes that encompassed a great many men.

Q And there have been amicable relations with the employers since 1934? A I would say that the relations with the employers since 1934 have been on the whole very amicable within the limits that I have described. We have contracts with the employers.

Q When are the contracts entered into? A Usually once a year. Some of them run for two years, but usually once a year.

Q And what happens at the expiration of a contract?

A Well, the men who are covered by the contract that is expiring, that is, in the particular section of the union -- the union is made up of thirty or more sections -- these men directly involved are summoned to a meeting or a series of meetings where they discuss the former contract, the proposals for the new contract, projected contract, where they put forward their ideas as to what the new contract should cover, what it should include. It is voted on, and then the projected contract is

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

taken to the representatives of the employers, presented, a series of discussions and negotiations takes place, and as a rule the contract is signed, most always in a modified form, but not always, and one could say not very often are the demands that are made by the men at first encompassed in the final contract. But the men have the say, they determine whether the contract should be accepted as the employers correct it, or rather, as they resubmit their own ideas, or whether a stand should be made. Usually it is a compromise.

Q Can you give us an estimate of how many contracts the union has signed between 1934 and 1941, in June? A Well, the number of contracts has grown each year since 1934. That is, new groups have been organized in the union, and each new group has a new contract. But the average number of contracts, I would say, that have been signed each year since 1934 up to the present by Local 544, 574 before that, -- I would say it would be about six hundred contracts with six hundred different employers.

Q Each year? A Yes, each year.

Q Now, is there anything with reference to arbitration in those contracts? A Yes, in most of them there are arbitration clauses, although not all of them.

Q To your knowledge, has the union ever arbitrated differences with the employers? A Yes, many times, -- many times.

Q Which officers in 544, prior to June, 1941, were subject to election? A The Executive Board is elected.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q How many members are there on it? A Seven members.

Q Seven? A Seven members of the Executive Board are elected each year.

Q Are any other officers elected? A No, no, -- that was the provision of the International Union of the Teamsters.

Q That is, that is in accordance with the constitution of the International? A That is correct.

Q How about the President of the Local? A Yes, he is a member of the Executive Board by virtue of his office; he is elected.

Q So there is an election for a President and he automatically becomes a member of the Executive Board? A That is correct.

Q Is that the same with the secretary-treasurer? A Yes.

Q And the financial secretary? A Well, the financial secretary and the secretary-treasurer is one and the same office. The recording secretary is also elected and a member of the Board.

Q The what? A Recording secretary.

Q The recording secretary. And what are the by-laws of the union with reference to organizers? A The local by-laws which are adopted by the membership have to be, of course, in conformity with -- or rather, not contradict or countervene the International by-laws. The Local by-laws provide for the appointment of organizers by the Executive Board.

Q And how many organizers did 544 have? A Well, there was never any set number. That is, the organizers were appointed according to the volume of work that was to be done by the Local.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

There was a big staff, however, of organizers. It varied from time to time.

Q When was the first election that you remember having been held in 544? A Well, after the re-entry into the International Union, the first election was held in the year of 1938.

Q And what was the custom of the Local with reference to the holding of these elections? A I beg your pardon?

Q What was the custom of the Local with reference to holding these elections as to time and method? A The custom was established here first of all by Local 574, and it was, I should say, unique in the International Teamsters' movement. That is, the custom was established and the by-laws provided for that, holding a two-day election -- that is, two days for the election each year. The election was held by what is known as the Australian Ballot System; that is, voting by ballot, secret ballot, with two days in which all the members were urged to come to the polls and vote. The polls were open at seven o'clock in the morning and stayed open until nine in the evening for two consecutive days, and the membership was naturally notified by the election board, which was elected by the membership, to participate.

Q When was the election board elected? A The election board was elected by the membership at the time of the nominations, which preceded the election by one month, usually.

Q And to your best recollection, was there any opposition to the defendants who were running for office since 1937 or '38?

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

A There has been opposition to the leadership of the Local in practically all elections. That is, men nominated from the floor have run for office in the elections against the leadership of the union, which was constant, you might say, from the early days.

Q Did any opposition ever claim fraud in the elections?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: Is that material, Mr. Goldman?

MR. GOLDMAN: I think so. After all, one of the issues in the case is the so-called control of the union.

THE COURT: I assume all of this was background.

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: He may answer.

THE WITNESS: I have never personally heard anyone, except one or two men, make that charge.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Who counted the ballots? A The election board that was elected by the members. The election board, it should be understood, was elected by the membership at the time of the nominations, and the by-laws provided that nobody could be a member of the election board who was in any way officially connected with the union. It could not be one of the functionaries, and certainly not one of those running for office. That is, the election board was a completely different board than any official board of the union. They conducted the elections, got

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

up the ballots, supervised the election, had entire power over the election progress, and the counting of the ballots.

Q Who decided the capacity of the members to vote?

A I beg your pardon?

Q Who decided as to which member was permitted to vote or not?

A That was a matter of the by-laws. That is, members who were paid up in their dues, in good standing, had a right to vote in the election.

Q And they had to show their paid up membership?

A That is correct. They were checked by the election board against the ledgers of the union that designated whether a man was eligible to vote or not.

Q When was the last election held in 544, prior to the secession from the AFL? A In January of 1941.

Q Were there any opposition candidates then? A Yes, yes, there were, -- candidates for every post, if I recall it.

Q How was the decision to secede from the AFL arrived at?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: He may answer.

THE WITNESS: A decision was made by the members of the union. The responsible functionaries of the union, the Executive Board, those organizers charged with the responsibility of reporting to the Board on the controversy that was raging between the union and President Tobin and the membership made the deci-

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

sion to withdraw from the American Federation of Labor, and accept the invitation of the CIO for affiliation.

Q How many members were present at that meeting at which this decision was made? A I haven't any exact count, but my best estimate would be between 2,800 and 3,000 men.

Q Do you recollect as to how many voted for secession and how many against --

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: I object to that as immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: I don't think that is material. The important thing is that there was a secession.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, your Honor, I think that it is also important to give the jury an understanding that this so-called secession was voted upon by the men, and that the overwhelming majority favored it.

THE COURT: Well, he has already testified as to the number who voted. It is to be assumed, I suppose, that the majority voted in favor of it or it wouldn't have occurred.

MR. GOLDMAN: Very well.

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Furthermore, we haven't attempted to establish that they didn't have elections in 544. The admissions even show that the defendants were in control of it because they held the offices in the thing, so what does this rebut at all?

MR. GOLDMAN: I sat through three weeks here and I got

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

the impression -- maybe I got a wrong impression -- that somehow or other the Socialist Workers' Party was organized in some way to control the union, not through elections held, the men electing them, but that they would put men into control of the unions and thus create a conspiracy. That is the impression that I got and I want to show to the jury that all of the officers in the union were elected, and that all the things done there were by vote of the men.

THE COURT: Well, you are being permitted to do that; go ahead.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Did you personally participate in asking for democratic elections after the secession?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: This is when now?

MR. ANDERSON: After the secession.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is, after the disaffiliation with the AFL, I am asking him whether he personally knows anything about the attempt to get elections and the opposition of the AFL to these elections.

THE COURT: I think that has relation to the same subject matter that you have just discussed. He may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I participated actively in attempting to get elections under the State Labor Law and under the National

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Labor Relations Law for the men to settle the question that the International and Mr. Tobin refused to allow to be settled by the vote of the men in the union. We attempted to get elections to settle that question. The AFL refused --

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Now, let me renew my objection.

THE COURT: This last, I don't think has any -- whether Tobin allowed the elections or not, is not involved here.

MR. GOLDMAN: I would say that he should confine himself to the attempts to get an election and the result.

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: But the questions, if your Honor please, are an open invitation for the witness to inject into this case his feud with the AFL, which has nothing whatever to do with the issues in this case. It is obvious to me that that is what counsel is trying to do, and I think it ought to be stopped.

THE COURT: I think counsel understands, and I think the witness now understands what the view of the court is. You may proceed.

MR. ANDERSON: Outside of the word "yes," we move that the rest of it be stricken out.

THE COURT: It will go out.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Are you a member of the Socialist Workers' Party, Mr. Dunne? A Yes.

Q How long have you been a member of that party? A Since the organization of the party.

Q That was in what year, Mr. Dunne? A 1938.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q And were you a member of the so-called Trotskyite group before that? A Yes.

Q For how long? A Since its organization in this country in 1928, the fall of 1928.

Q Of what political organization were you a member prior to that?

A I was a member of the Communist Party.

Q What happened in 1928 when you left the Communist Party?

A I was expelled for supporting the idea of giving a hearing to the ideas of Trotsky inside the Communist Party. I was expelled for advancing that idea.

Q Now, are you acquainted with the program and principles of the Socialist Workers' Party? A I should say I am fairly well acquainted with it, yes.

Q And are you acquainted with its principles and program with reference to trade unionism? A Yes.

Q What purpose or purposes did you have in being active in organizing the drivers, Mr. Dunne? A Well, I was a driver, or a coal yard worker myself, that is number 1; and I, in common with all other workers in that line, wanted a better standard of living. I was interested in organizing the union for the purpose of benefitting the men who were eligible to membership in such a union. That is primary and fundamental, as far as I was concerned.

Q Now, as a member of the Socialist Workers' Party, did you have any other purpose in organizing the truck drivers?

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

A Well, except in the sense that as a Socialist, as a Marxist, I have always believed in, since I accepted those ideas, -- of propagating those ideas with my fellow workers wherever I worked, wherever I could, and in that sense that also is a very important part of my work in the trade union movement, or in any other workers' movement particularly that I have been associated with, -- propagating the ideas of Socialism, attempting to build a revolutionary Socialist party, Marxist party.

Q What policy did the Minneapolis branch of the Socialist Workers' Party follow with reference to trade unionism in Minneapolis?

A Well, the policy of the Socialist Workers' Party as such, that policy is to build, organize strong unions of the workers in order that they may benefit by better standards of living better wages, and something to say about their lives in connection with their jobs. That is the primary and fundamental object of the Socialist Workers' Party's trade union policy, together with the other part that I described as my own views, that I accepted, propagating the ideas of and the necessity for the building of a Socialist Party to aid in changing the present capitalist order and ushering in a Socialist society.

Q In your activities as a trade unionist, what relationship did you have with those who are not members of the party?

A Always a very cordial relationship, I should say, on the whole -- very seldom any difficulty because of my views. It is not the policy of the party to force the view that we hold, that I hold,

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

on other people unwillingly. We were associated with men in order to build a trade union in the trade union movement. Where we could, we convinced them of the necessity for building a political party as I have described, but that work, that idea of propagating our views, was secondary always to the main task of the union movement. It came as a result of participation in the movement. But I should say, very cordial relationships on the whole.

Q Were you ever a member of the Executive Board of Local 544?

A Not of Local 544, no.

Q Were you in any way connected with any union where you had something to say with reference to the appointment of organizers or officials, or employees of that union? A No, no, I have not been.

Q Did any members of the Executive Board of 544 ever discuss with you as to possible appointments of employees of 544, such as organizers? A Oh, quite often, and the staff as a whole took that up also.

Q And what was the criterion for any choice that you made?

A The fitness of the man for the post that was vacant or for the work that was to be done, that was the sole criterion.

Q Did you ever suggest, or did anybody ever suggest the appointment of a member of the Socialist Workers' Party, simply because he was a member of the party, discounting his abilities as organizer for the union? A Definitely not.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

37

Q Did you personally try to get members into the party?

A Yes, I did.

Q What was your approach to people whom you wanted to be members of the party? A I attempted as best I could to convince them of the need for it, desirability of doing it on the basis of our long time program and our outlook, the outlook of the party, the program of the party utilizing naturally the evidences of good work that I was doing as a party member, and so forth and so forth.

Q Did you ever promise anyone a job in the union as a prize for joining the union? A No, definitely not.

Q Did you ever promise anyone that he could hold his job in the union if he were to join the party? A No indeed.

Q What is the policy of the party with reference to the basis upon which members should join? A Well, the policy of the party is to invite workers and people generally who accept the views of the party into the party. Now, it doesn't follow that they expect them to understand fully, but we try only to approach and ask those people to join whom we think have the possibility of understanding it, and the intention to attempt to understand it, and accept and agree to what they read, and find out about the party.

Q And do you ask workers to join who are not very well educated in the party principles? A Well, there is no set rule for that, but generally speaking, that is not done. Certainly I do

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

not do that. When a worker comes to me and says, "I want to join your party," -- and insists on it, and many of them have done that, by the way, for a varied number of reasons, and when one is in a post of authority and prestige in the union, as I have been, you are not always anxious to accept the application of certain types who come with that demand. I have had long discussions with men, many men, for that reason. I tried to be assured of their sincerity and their real political understanding and outlook before I accepted them into the party, or recommended them for the party. That was my general approach to it.

Q How many members were there in the union at the time of the split?

A How many party members?

Q No, how many members in the union -- how many workers?

A Workers in the union, about 5,500, I should say, is my best estimate.

Q And how many, to your best estimate, party members were there in the union? A I couldn't be exact because I didn't keep track of that, but generally I should say there were 20 or 25 party members in the union.

Q When did you first become acquainted with James Bartlett?

A Well, definitely to say that I was acquainted with him, I think we should place it in 1936, although I knew him by sight and had spoken to him -- that is, had answered his charges against me personally many times on the sidewalk and on soap boxes, but I didn't know him personally until 1936.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q And you heard him speak before that, did you?

A Oh, yes. He was very active in the Communist Party.

Q At the time you heard him, did he ever speak against you?

A Very viciously over a period of time.

Q Do you recollect any particular instance?

MR. ANDERSON: We object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: This certainly is an issue that has been in the case, whether deliberately or otherwise, by the Government. Bartlett has given basis certainly for this man to answer him.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, if it is for the purpose of impeachment of Bartlett, we object to it as without foundation.

THE COURT: I will overrule the objection.

THE WITNESS: What was the question?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

THE WITNESS: I have one very vivid recollection. I know of dozens of cases, but I have one very vivid recollection.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) When was that? A In the early part of 1934, I believe. At any rate, it was at the time of the big unemployed demonstration at the Court House here. Bartlett was an active organizer for the Communist Party in those days in the unemployed councils, and I was also active in an unemployed organization then, working on -- ERA, I think the alphabetical designation was at the time -- and I participated in this demonstration. Bartlett took the stand, or took the soap box,--

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

I suppose that is a better designation for it. At any rate, he was put up to speak particularly against me. He denounced me as a stool pigeon and a police spy, and as a traitor and a faker, and so forth and so forth for a considerable time, -- advised the workers not to pay any attention to what I said, and to run me out of the demonstration, and so forth. That was his line.

Q Did you ever speak with Bartlett during the 1934 strike?

A I heard him say so here on the stand, but I have absolutely no recollection of talking to him during that period at all. I knew he was -- I saw him many, many times. He was very active around, also with the opposition at that time, but I don't recall having spoken to him. I heard him say, if I may say so, that he came to me and said that he wanted to act on the picket lines, and that he was not a member of the Communist Party. I not only don't remember it, but I am absolutely certain that that is not so.

Q When was the first time you saw Bartlett where you had any conversation with him? A Well, in 1936 is the first time that I had any conversation with Bartlett.

Q And what was the subject of that conversation?

A He came to me with a proposal that we -- that is, meaning 544, -- should assist him in organizing the warehouse workers' union. He told me that he had spoken to some other members of 544 before that. I knew that what he said was true, that he had

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

41 spoken to other members, and he told me that he wanted to get the support of Local 544 to organize the warehouse union. He said it could be a big union, and that he had finally decided that he no longer accepted the Communist Party's position. I asked him what that meant. I knew him as a politically developed man, and I asked him what that meant, whether he had broken with the Communist Party, and he said, "Well, I am definite about breaking with their trade union line." I said, "Is that the extent of your break with the Communist Party?"

"Well," he said, "I don't know what they think about it, but," he said, "I am not so clear yet on all the rest of it, of their program, but the trade union policy, I know, is wrong. I know you men are right and I want you to help me. I know that you are the men that know how to build a union; the Communist Party does not, and I want your help."

I told him that if he was really sincere about his statement and proved it by his actions, that he would find no difficulty in working with 544, because 544 was very anxious to organize the warehousemen as a whole, and the women who worked in warehouses as well, and told him that if he was sincere about it, that he would find no difficulty. He asked me if I wanted him to join the party, the Socialist Workers' Party -- or the Socialist Party at that time. I told him that I wouldn't recommend that he be a member of the party at all if he hadn't cleared up his mind as to whether he had a complete break with the Com-

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

42 munist Party or not.

I said, "What is your purpose on the one hand of telling me that you have broken with the Communist Party, in so far as their trade union policy is concerned, and then you ask me to invite you into the party and to our party?" I said, "That doesn't sound very good to me. I don't think you should join." That is the way I talked to Bartlett.

He said, "Well, should I write a statement about my views?" I had suggested something about giving me a clear picture of really how he stood, what his real opinions were. I wanted to test him a little bit, -- I wanted to find out whether he had actually come to a real break with the Communist Party or not. I was very interested in that, and I suggested that he write such a statement. After he spoke about it, then again I said, "Go ahead and write the statement."

He said, "What kind of a statement do you want," I said, "Formulate the statement in your own words, Jimmy. I haven't anything to do with that. If I make a statement, certainly that won't give me a picture of what you are thinking about." So he finally agreed to write the statement, and he did write such a statement.

THE COURT: I think, Mr. Goldman, before you take up another subject we will recess for ten minutes.

(AFTERNOON RECESS.)

THE COURT: Proceed, gentlemen.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q (By Mr. Goldman) I show you, Mr. Dunne, Plaintiff's Exhibit 197-A, being the statement made by Mr. Bartlett, which Mr. Bartlett claims to have made at the time he joined the Socialist Workers' Party, and ask you to glance at it and tell the court and jury as to whether or not he made that statement.

I also hand you the original in handwriting to refresh your memory.

(Documents handed to the witness.)

A Well, I know the statement that was made was not this statement.

Q What did you do with the original statement, Mr. Dunne?

A It was sealed up in an envelope and kept in the party headquarters for about a year, I believe, or more, until after Bartlett was for some months, as I recall it, a member of the party, and later was destroyed.

Q Was it ever published? A No.

Q Now, to the best of your recollection, will you tell us what the statement that he gave consisted of?

A Well, the statement that Bartlett gave me had as its main outline his disagreement with and his repudiation of the Communist Party's trade union policy. Now, it encompassed a few other criticisms of the Communist Party about their unemployed work and so forth, but that was the body of the statement, the criticism of the Communist Party's past and present trade union policy.

Q Who asked Bartlett to join the party, Mr. Dunne?

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

44

A I don't know; I didn't.

Q Did you promise Bartlett any assistance in organizing his union if he joined the party? A No. I told Bartlett that he should not join our party, and that he would not be allowed to join our party unless he definitely made up his mind that he agreed with our party and its program, and was through with the Communist Party, and with that he would get all the assistance from Local 544, so far as I had anything to say about it, and I knew or thought that would be the position of the majority of the leadership of 544, if he pursued a correct trade union policy and really interested himself in the building of a union without reference to where he belonged politically.

Q Did you have any conversations that you recollect immediately prior to Bartlett's joining of the party?

A I beg your pardon?

Q Did you have any conversations with Bartlett immediately preceding his joining of the party? A Well, conversations with Bartlett after he became active in helping to organize the warehouse workers, and especially when he moved the headquarters of that local union up to the Drivers' headquarters at 257 Plymouth. Conversations were had with him from time to time. I spoke with him at times almost entirely about the trade union work, advising him as best as I could, and answering many questions of his about the union, about the general work of the union movement there. Most of the conversations that I recall

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

just after he came into the trade union headquarters with the warehouse union, had to do with his opposition to Roy Weir, whom he thought was going to try to take his union away from him, as he put it. I remember of telling him that it was not his union, nobody's union, except the members, and I didn't think that anything like that would occur. Those kind of conversations were had with him. I recall very few conversations on other questions.

Q Well, do you recall any conversations with him with reference to his joining the party subsequent to the ones that you already testified to? A No, I don't really recall any definite conversations with Bartlett.

Q Now, you listened to Bartlett's testimony, did you, Mr. Dunne? A I should perhaps correct myself here to this extent, that Bartlett -- I am sure I remember him saying that he was going to join the party, or he was ready to join the party, or something of that kind. But I don't remember definitely where it was, nor when, exactly. I know that that was said, though.

Q Did you hear Bartlett testify that early in January, 1938, you spoke at a Socialist Workers' Party meeting where you stated that the party should not have any illusions that Socialism could be brought in by the ballot box, but maintained -- that is, that you maintained it was necessary to have an armed overthrow of the capitalist government in order to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat? Do you remember his testify-

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

ing that?

A Yes, I remember his testifying that.

Q Did you speak at any meeting early in 1938 before the Socialist Workers' Party on the question of the overthrow of the Government, or on the question of how Socialism was to be introduced?

A Well, I discussed that question -- that is, the application of our program to the task ahead, many times. I don't recall that particular meeting, although I am certain that Bartlett heard me speak on the question of our program on several occasions. Certainly he didn't hear me say that we preferred, or wanted, or advocated an armed overthrow.

Q Why are you certain? A Because I never said that at any time.

Q And why didn't you?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that. Why he didn't is immaterial.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Bartlett testified that in the fall of 1938 at a membership meeting you said that in 1934 the workers' party, with its leadership of 574 developing its program in the trade union movement, was able to take over the City of Minneapolis, and that you pointed this out as an example of how it could be done on a nation-wide scale, if the party had leaders with influence and prestige in the important trade unions. Did you at any time lecture on this particular subject?

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

47 A I lectured on the subject of the significance of the rise and organization of Local 544 in the Drivers' movement here many times.

Q And what did you say about that? A I am not certain about the exact date that Mr. Bartlett gives there, but I recall having given a discussion about the significance of the influence that the party had in the organization of the General Drivers' Union, and the gist of my remarks were concerned with the question of the influence of the party in the trade union movement, and I am sure that what I said there, and that Bartlett has distorted, is that if a similar situation obtained in a number of impo rtant cities where the party had as much influence in the trade union movement as they did in Minneapolis, that the trade union movement would be influenced greatly by the ideas of the party. Now, that was the gist of such a lecture, and I recall quite definitely making this analogy of what could be possible.

Q Did you ever say that the Minneapolis strike of 1934 showed how the trade unions could take over the country?

A No, -- I heard a lot of "screwballs" talk that way, but I never did. We never had any such ideas as that.

MR. ANDERSON: Who did he say he heard, Mr. Reporter?

THE WITNESS: Many "screwballs." I beg your pardon -- many undisciplined workers, and people who like to make sensations, and so forth, who have no responsibility in their talk or actions.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Bartlett testified that you said at a membership meeting that the party must recruit from the union movement for the purpose of developing a general strike at an opportune moment, namely, a revolutionary situation. Did you ever discuss the question of recruitment from the unions to the party with reference to a general strike, or a revolutionary situation?
A No, definitely not. That is a complete distortion of my remarks on that question. As a matter of fact, I have spoken on many occasions against the concept of a general strike, taking over industry, or anything of the kind.
Q What is the policy --

MR. ANDERSON: Just a moment. We move to strike out all of the answer after, "No, definitely not," as not responsive, and the conclusion of the witness, and not a statement of fact.

THE COURT: I will sustain that.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) What is the policy of the party with reference to a general strike? A Well, in so far as a general strike-- by that, one can mean many things. We, speaking of a general strike, I should say, would mean something on the nature of what occurred in Minneapolis in 1934. We are not opposed to a widespread strike, if it is absolutely necessary to advance the interests of the workers, and they cannot achieve their object by negotiation and conciliation, refusal of the employers to meet them, and so forth, but in the sense of a political general strike, I never had advocated that, and the party's policy is

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

49 certainly not that.

Q Did you ever advocate a general strike for the purpose of creating a revolutionary situation? A No, definitely not.

Q What is the party policy with reference to that?

A The party policy doesn't encompass that as a good factor or a factor at all. The fact that strikes may take place under certain conditions that might be described as revolutionary is one thing, but the party does not advocate that as the method of changing from the capitalist system to a system of socialism.

Q Bartlett testified that you told him that at an opportune time, namely, a revolutionary situation, the party would put in motion an armed uprising to overthrow the Government. Do you remember ever saying any such thing to Bartlett?

A No, sir, definitely not.

Q Do you remember talking to Bartlett and discussing with him the question of the transition to Socialism? A I don't recall discussing that question personally with Bartlett. As a matter of fact, although I talked many times to Bartlett, as I said before, very few conversations dealt with the program of the party. Bartlett wasn't very much interested in that, by the way.

MR. ANDERSON: What was the last part of that answer?

THE WITNESS: I say, Bartlett wasn't very much interested in that kind of conversation.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Now, Bartlett testified that on December 23, 1940, you told him that since Bartlett was no longer in sympathy

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

with the revolutionary cause, he need not expect any sympathy of the movement as a whole, and at that conversation you also told him that war was imminent and that he should be active in his union, which was made up primarily of people of draft age, and that he should be recruiting members into the party, or making them sympathetic to the party in order that "we might have party contact with them while in the army." Did you have any conversation with Bartlett on or about December 23, 1940?

A Yes, I did.

Q And what did he say and what did you say at that conversation?

A Well, I cannot recapture the exact words of the conversation, but I can give you the gist of our discussion. I don't recall the exact date, but I think that is approximately correct, about that date. Bartlett, who had been on very distant terms, or a distant relationship with me for quite a period, because he knew I was critical of the way he was handling himself in his union -- not only myself, but many others of the trade unionists there --

MR. ANDERSON: We move to strike out all of the answer thus far given as not responsive to the question.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Proceed to say what you said and what he said, Mr. Dunne. A He asked me at that time to have a talk with him and I said, "All right, do you want to have the talk right now?" He said, "Yes."

"Where will we go?" He said, "Let's go in one of the

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

51

offices." So we went in, as I recall it, into the Teamsters' Joint Council office. His first remark to me was a demand that I line up his executive board, as he called it, in support of him in the coming election in his union. He accused me of not correcting, as he called it, the members of his executive board that were opposed to him. I asked him what he expected me to do about such a state of affairs. He said, "Well, I know you have got a lot of influence here, and I think that you should point out to these men that they should support me in the election and not run against me."

I told him that he finally had, after all of his bad work in the union, lack of work for the union, going into the bowling alley business as a private enterprise, generally conducting himself not for the union but for his own personal interests -- that he had lost the respect of the fine group of young men in his executive board, and that not only would I not line them up as he called it, but I would, in so far as I had anything to say about it, support them against him.

Q And what happened -- A I told him that he had become the ordinary, fat little business agent and that the movement was not interested in supporting that kind of material in the trade union movement.

Q And what did he say in answer to that? A Well, that about ended the conversation, as I recall it. There wasn't much more to be said after that.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q Now, did you talk about the 1940 Service Act with him at all at that time? A Positively not. It would be exoluded -- any other kind of discussion would be excluded automatically in such a conversation as I had with him.

Q Did he tell you that, at that conversation, that he left the party because he disagreed with the idea of armed revolution?

A No, he didn't tell me that he had left the party at all. I knew that he hadn't been a party member, or a loyal man for a long while before that, and he knew I knew it.

Q And did you talk with him about the relationship between officers and enlisted men? A Definitely not.

Q And did you at any time tell him that, "We should take lessons from the Russian Revolution," and talk with him about "The Lessons of October," written by Trotsky?

A I might have at some time, although I don't recall it, but certainly not in that conversation. At some time prior I might have discussed that question with him, but I don't recall it.

Q And did you tell him at that conversation that Bartlett was a poor Bolshevik, and that as long as he was not going along with the Socialist Workers' Party he would have to suffer the consequences and be forced out of the union? A No, I did not.

Q Bartlett testified that at a meeting in 1939 there was a raffle of "The History of the Russian Revolution," a book written by Trotsky, and that you said at the time that the history was an example which the workers in American should follow because it

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

53

contained the lessons and the prerequisites for a successful revolution in this country. Did you ever lecture on the Russian Revolution? A I don't recall of having lectured on the Russian Revolution specifically. I very likely, -- I am sure I did recommend the reading of the history of the Russian Revolution by Trotsky. I recommended that on numerous occasions to hundreds of people, party members and non-party people.

Q Do you recall any such incident as a raffle?

A I don't recall the one he testifies to there. I really don't recall that. I spoke on several occasions, many occasions in the branch meetings about various books and documents, historical and otherwise of interest to the party membership, and I could very well have talked about that, but not in the way he describes.

Q Were you present at any meetings or conversations with Bartlett where he criticized the leadership of 544?

A I don't believe I understood the question.

Q Were you present at any meeting, or did you ever hold any conversation with Bartlett, where Bartlett criticized the leadership of 544? A Oh, yes; in the early days when Bartlett came into the union as an independent truck driver, he criticized the leadership of the union from the floor on any number of occasions.

Q What section of the truck drivers did he belong to?

A The section of the union that is known as the "Independent Truck Drivers," or "Independent Truck Owners."

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

54

Q And is there any condition for joining that particular section?

A Yes, one must be the owner of a truck, operating the truck himself -- that is, as a man operates his own truck, then he becomes a member of the union as a whole, but is assigned to that section.

Q Must any owner of a truck make a statement to that effect before he is allowed at meetings in that section?

A Yes, that section of the union has always had, or almost always had a committee called the Ways and Means Committee, a sub-committee that dealt with the problem, which was a very real problem, of the eligibility of men for that section of the union, and a man to be a member of that section had to demonstrate he owned and operated a truck of his own. We usually took the license number and looked up the record of his truck, and so forth, and kept track of it in that way through their various committees.

Q The witness Roy Wieneke testified that early in 1939 you spoke at a party meeting and said that the idea for the Union Defense Guard came from Trotsky. Did you speak about the Union Defense Guard and did you say such a thing?

A The particular meeting that is referred to there, I don't recall that exactly. I know I spoke about the Union Defense Guard on many occasions, and I might very well and very likely did indicate on numerous occasions in party meetings that Trotsky agreed with the idea of Union Defense Guards, but certainly I

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

never said the idea came from there, because I knew better than that. I had had experience with union guards long before I knew Trotsky, and I couldn't have attributed the origin of the idea for defense guards to Trotsky.

Q Did you ever speak to Trotsky about the particular Union Defense Guard organized in Local 544? A No, I don't recall any such conversation with Trotsky.

Q Did you at the same meeting testified to by Roy Wieneke say that the Union Defense Guard would masquerade under the object of fighting fascism or the Silver Shirts, but in reality would be the first part of the militia for the Socialist Workers' Party? A No, no, that is a fanciful or a dictated statement the witness made, not my statement.

Q Did you say, as claimed by Wieneke, that through its control of 544 the Socialist Workers' Party would have control over the Union Defense Guard? A No, no, I did not. It wasn't the policy of the party at all. I couldn't have said such a thing. We were very anxious to organize defense guards at that time when they were needed. We wanted it adopted by the trade union movement as a whole.

MR. ANDERSON: I move to strike out all of the answer, except, "No, I did not," as not responsive to the question.

THE COURT: Oh, I think that may stand.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) The witness Henry Harris testified that in the late summer of 1940 at a party meeting, in discussing the defense

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

of the Soviet Union, you stated that in the event the United States was in the war, you would, the party would tie up transportation and work to sabotage industry. Do you remember making any such statement? A No, such a statement like that from me is impossible. It is not the party's policy or outlook. I did not make such a statement.

Q What is the party's policy with reference to sabotage?

A We are definitely opposed to it in any form.

Q Were you down in Mexico in '38? A I beg your pardon?

Q In 1938? A Yes, I was in Mexico.

Q Do you remember the statement that was introduced that you gave to some lawyer or some representative of the insurance company in San Antonio, I believe? A Yes.

Q Will you tell the court and jury the circumstances under which you made the statement, and if you know by whom the car was actually owned that took you and the others down to Mexico?

A The statement that I made to the attorney for the insurance company who carried the insurance on the union cars, or on the cars that were owned by an organizer, — the union always carried the insurance on the cars, whether or not the union owned them or the organizers owned them. That varied from time to time. The statement that I made to him was that the union owned the car and was responsible for the insurance. He understood that, too, after inquiring. Now, since that time I have learned that there is a possibility that the union did not own the car at that

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

57

time. I don't know now positively. When I made the statement, it was my opinion that the union did own the car; I am not sure of that now.

Q Do you know the custom of the union with reference to the cars that were operated by the organizers? A Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: He answered that just a moment ago and said that the union carried the insurance on it, whether it was a union car or owned by the organizers.

MR. GOLDMAN: Very well.

Q (By Mr. Goldman) Mrs. Violet Williams testified that you said at a meeting that there "wouldn't be any voting; that the workers would just take over the Government by armed force." Did you ever make any such statement?

A No, I did not.

Q Now, do you know who paid Hanson's salary while he was in Mexico, Mr. Dunne? A The party helped to take care of his family expenses. I don't know whether the party paid his salary while he was there or not. What money he got, the party paid for in one way or another.

Q Did the Executive Board of the union pay his salary while he was down in Mexico? A No, definitely not.

Q Did you know Tommy Williams, Mr. Dunne? A Yes, I knew him very well.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

58

Q He was a member of the party? A At two different times, as I recall it.

Q Tell the court and jury exactly what led to the fight between Tommy Williams and the leadership of Local 544.

A Williams was put on as an organizer by the Executive Board of the union sometime in 1938, if I am not mistaken. The union needed an organizer, and he was put on because of the need for an organizer. Tommy Williams was a very energetic man, a man of long experience in the trade union movement. He was a man not only of great energy, but a man of very strong personal opinions, and he was a man who was extremely difficult to work with in the sense that one never could be sure what he was going to do tomorrow. We had great difficulty -- the Board always had great difficulty in utilizing his services because he persisted in following his own personal policy, rather than following the policy of the Board and the union. Over a period of time this became more aggravated. His habits, -- many of them led him into more difficulties than his lack of organization sense. Coupled together, his violation of the union's rules became intolerable, and when he began to act entirely too irresponsible, not only with organization work but with other forms of union responsibility, such as funds, the Executive Board discharged Tommy Williams.

Q And then began his opposition to the union, is that right?

A Well, it developed quite a few months prior to his discharge,

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

59 as a matter of fact. We tried to save Tommy Williams from himself over a long period of time, -- tried very hard, without avail.

Q Now, did you ever have any conversations with E. G. Holstein with reference to his work in the union?

A Yes, many, many a conversation with Holstein.

Q And do you recollect any particular conversations?

A Well, I couldn't give you dates and places exactly, but I can tell you what was generally talked about when I talked with him.

Q No, I mean what you said to Holstein and what Holstein said to you. A Yes, I can tell you that generally. I can't give you all the conversations, because there were scores of them, -- generally in relation to his lack of responsibility in union work, and to his propensity to go off on tangents by himself and pay no attention to union policy, to union affairs, and to union welfare. Those were my general conversations with Holstein. He was always in hot water.

Q Any conversations with reference to money matters?

A Yes, --

Q What were -- A (Continuing) -- on a couple of occasions.

Q What were those? A I told him that he was not the type who could handle funds belonging to other people, and that he should try to find another place, another way to make a living besides being an organizer. He always wanted to be an organizer. I thought it was much better for him and the movement and every-

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

60

body concerned if he had a job where he could work for good wages and good union conditions, rather than attempt to be an organizer and spoil both the organizing work and his own reputation.

Q Do you know whether he is a married man? A Yes.

Q How many children has he? A He has a large family. I don't know how many children -- he has a large family, but I don't know how many children exactly.

Q Have you any idea as to the number? A No.

Q Holstein testified that after he registered for the draft you talked to him on the corner of Plymouth and Washington, that he told you that he had received his number, and that you said to him, "I wish we had a couple of thousand like you in the Army." Did you have any conversation with him about that?

A We were against sabotage in the Army, and I certainly couldn't have said that seriously. I don't even remember the conversation.

Q You mean, if two thousand men were in the Army, that would constitute sabotage? A It wouldn't be a very good situation, in my opinion.

Q How long have you known Sid Brennan? A I believe since 1935 or '36; I don't remember before that.

Q Did you ever have any conversations with him in November, 1940, in the Rex Bar, about a draft number, wherein you told him that he could do good work for the party in the Army by kicking about

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

61

the beds and the food? A No, definitely not. I certainly never said that to him.

Q What was your relationship with Sid Brennan in November, 1940, if you recollect? A Well, Sid Brennan was on quite unfriendly terms with not only myself but with practically the entire leadership of 544.

Q Do you remember a meeting having been held at the Nicollet Hotel for the purpose of getting people to rejoin the party?

A Yes, I recall such a meeting.

Q Was it at the Nicollet Hotel or the West Hotel, which?

A The Nicollet Hotel.

Q And when was that? A Well, that was in the early part of the summer -- yes, it was just after the first assault on Comrade Trotsky in Mexico. I think at the end of May was when the meeting was.

Q Were you at any meeting held in the Nicollet Hotel sometime in October, 1940? A I could have been. I don't know that I was. The union held meetings there quite often, the union staff, the union stewards, or some section of them -- conferences of one kind or another. I could have been at such a meeting; I don't remember it, though.

Q Did you ever have a talk in July, 1940, with Gene Williams about party members organizing cliques in the Army?

A No, I had very few conversations with Gene Williams during the entire time I knew him. I certainly didn't have that kind of

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

62

a conversation with him.

Q By the way, what was the telephone number of the Union 544, AFL, prior to June 9, 1941? A Geneva 4691, I think it was.

Q Was that the telephone number of the union in October, 1940?

A Yes, I should say so.

Q And what is the telephone number of the party headquarters?

A Main 7781.

Q And the address of the party headquarters is what?

A 919 Marquette Avenue.

Q Do you remember having any kind of a conversation with Eugene Williams at the Rex Bar where you talked to him about arsenals and guns and a revolution? A No, I don't recall any such conversations. As I say, I had very few conversations with any of the Williams boys. They were not the kind to enter into serious conversations with, and I certainly had no serious conversations with them about anything except ordinary day-to-day union work. Now, it is not impossible that I talked to them about the party at times when they were party members, but very, very seldom, and I certainly had no such conversation as this with Gene Williams.

Q What, if anything, did you have to do with the organization of the Union Defense Guard? A Well, I participated quite actively in it in the early days of its formation, in the early part of the period in which it took form. That is, I urged the idea.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

Q What is that? A I urged the idea of the organization of such a Guard, Union Guard.

Q You urged it on whom? A On the membership of the union that had been called to meetings to discuss the question.

Q And when was that? A In the middle of '38, I believe, -- that is, in July or August. I am no t clear, but I think it was in August that the Union Guard was organized.

Q And do you recollect the first meeting that we held with reference to the organization of a Union Defense Guard?

A Yes, I believe I do recall the first place that was discussed. If I am not mistaken, it was at Tommy Williams' house.

Q And do you recollect who were there? A I can't say that I recall all that were there at the time. They were organizers or were active stewards of the union.

Q How many, approximately? A Oh, fifteen or twenty, I should say -- something like that.

Q And did you discuss the question of organizing the Union Defense Guard at that meeting? A Yes, I discussed the need for it.

Q And what did you say? A I pointed out the serious situation that was apparently developing in connection with the rise of these semi-fascist groups, bands, and particularly the Silver Shirts.

Q What information did you have about the Silver Shirts in Minneapolis? A Well, it was a matter of general knowledge for those who read the papers and followed those kind of events -- it

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

had been reported in the press, and there was general knowledge of the fact that the Silver Shirts were organizing and attempting to build an organization in the Twin Cities in that period. We had other information as well. Some of the Jewish people that I knew quite well for a long period of years were very agitated about the question and talked with me and with other members of the union about this. I knew it quite well, because I followed those kind of things and watched the development of those kind of movements in that period, not only here but throughout the country, and therefore I had a feeling of alarm, as did the other members in the leadership of the union, and we advocated the organization of a guard that would be ready to protect the union and its institutions from assaults and attacks of groups of this kind. That was the reason for the organization of the guard and, as I say, I advocated the organization of the guard, having had previous experience, by the way, with this idea and with the idea of organizations of workers to protect their own institutions.

Q Then this meeting called at Tommy Williams' house was a sort of a meeting of an initiating committee, was it?

A That would be, I think, a correct way to indicate -- to term it, yes.

Q And what decision, if any, was taken at that meeting?

A To call a meeting of men who would be invited -- all those whom we thought would appreciate the danger and who could be

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

depended upon to act responsively in such a situation. That is, there were many ideas advanced by the leadership generally of where to go to find the proper men. Now, we always know in the union, after the experiences that we went through for a number of years, who the active and reliable men are in the union, and in every crisis of the union, why, we depend upon the steward body and those closest to it, the more active men who have had long experience in the movement, to come to such a meeting, and that was the decision made there. The meeting was organized --

Q Who was given charge of the Union Defense Guard?

A Well, it was generally understood -- I am not sure now as to whether we made any formal motions or came to any definite decisions there, but in general I would say that Ray Rainbolt and men like Tommy Williams, men like Emil Hanson, would be put in charge, and that is what, I think, was done more or less, to direct the work of assembling and organizing the men.

Q And do you remember any meeting held subsequent to that initiating committee meeting? A Yes. I may not be entirely exact about this, but it seems to me that the next meeting that was held was held in a hall in northeast Minneapolis. That is my impression now.

Q Did you speak at that meeting? A Yes, I spoke at that meeting.

Q And did you speak at any other meetings of the Union Defense Guard? A Yes, I think I spoke at at least one other meeting.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

36 Q And what was the nature of your speech? A A review of the conditions that obtained in the country in relation to the trade union movement, and to the rise of these fascist bands and cliques, and elaborating on the idea of the organization of a defense guard, not only for our own union, but projected the idea and discussed that with the men who attended the meetings to advocate an organization of similar guards in other unions. We, as a matter of fact, I think, invited men from other unions to some of the meetings. I am quite sure that the workers who were active in the organization work did that. I know there were members of other unions at the meetings quite often, and who were members of the Guard, if I am not mistaken. That was the general line of my discussion, showing what the need was, the desirability of doing it, and discussing, together with those who raised questions, what procedure would be taken, would be had.

One of the things I know that we discussed in the very first meetings, the first two meetings anyway, was the question of making the union as a whole acquainted with the organization of the Guard so that it could not be misconstrued as some small group doing something without authority. We made preparations to report to the steward body and to the union as a whole, to carry items in the Northwest Organizer, and to generally give publicity to it, to the efforts, and to point out the reasons for it, keep track of it, and so forth.

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

67

Q Do you remember hearing the testimony of Elmer Buckingham who testified that at a meeting of the Union Defense Guard, you said that the Union Defense Guards were organized to overthrow the Government? A I heard him say that, but I can only say that it is an absolute untruth.

Q Now, did you keep fairly close to the Union Defense Guard, as far as knowing what happened at their meetings, and what they were doing? A No, my work prevented me from doing that. I was very busy on other things. I was out of town a great deal; sent out of town a great deal on various representative tasks for the union, organization work, and my work generally prevented that. I did not attend a great many Guard meetings; as a matter of fact, very few of them, I should say, although when I did attend, I participated as any other member of the Guard.

Q Did you have anything to do with the decision on target practice? A No, I wasn't at the meeting where that was decided.

Q Did any of the leading people of the Union Defense Guard discuss the question of what to do with the men in the early part of 1939? A I discussed that, I know, on several occasions with quite a number of the leading people in the leadership of the union and the Guard -- that is, the question of what to do with these men that had performed a real service for the union, how to indicate the union's interest in their work along this line, and the difficulty and the impossibility of calling meetings of men time after time when there was nothing for them to

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

68

do. The responsibility of leadership such as ours was, would not allow any fiction to take place. We decided that the best thing to do was, in view of the fact that the main object for which the Guard had been organized was no longer present, that is, the danger of assault upon the union, that it should be more or less of a skeleton organization, if at all, and it could be used in helping the union in arranging affairs of various kinds, such as has been described here by some of the other witnesses--policing the picnics, helping out at children's parties, organizing at dances and one thing or another to take care of the work that couldn't otherwise be done, except with a special body of people.

Q So that with the disappearance of the Silver Shirts danger, the Guard ceased to function as a defense guard?

A Yes, that is correct; that is correct.

Q Did the Socialist Workers' Party ever run candidates here in Minneapolis, Mr. Dunne? A Yes, on several occasions. It has always been the policy of the party to run candidates wherever it was possible to do so. It has not always been possible, but in every campaign where we had the possibility of filing a candidate, in conformity with our general political or parliamentary convictions, why, we filed a candidate or candidates.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is all.

THE COURT: Do you desire to start your cross examination?

MR. ANDERSON: I don't suppose we can get very far this

Copied at the National Archives at Kansas City

69 evening.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you will please keep in mind the admonitions of the court, and we will recess now until ten o'clock on Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 o'clock P. M., a recess was regularly taken until 10:00 o'clock A. M., Monday, November 24, 1941.)